MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 15, 1938.

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on October 15, 1938. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held September 29, 1938, were approved.

2.DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FLAG: The Commission took under consideration the designs submitted by the District of Columbia Flag Commission. The designs had been placed on display by the secretary, who had also prepared a list of the competitors (Exhibit A). The Commission decided that the design marked A, an adaptation of the Coat of Arms of George Washington, was the best. Mr. Borie offered the following statement:

> The design suggested by Mr. M. C. Hazen, President of the Board of Commissioners, D. C., consisting of the coat of arms of the Washington Family, is admirable in every way. It is good heraldry and makes a handsome, easily read and distinctive Flag. A Flag should be good heraldry and not picture painting and the Coat of Arms of Washington is perfectly sound.
>
> I made a few diagrams to show how many variations may be made in the proportions and spacing of the 2 bars, and yet come within the Heraldic description. They all look well, and it may be well to leave to the taste of the maker and owner, to devise the proportions.
>
> The same applies to the proportions of the Flag itself. For myself, I like most a square flag, but even one in which the hoist is higher than the fly, the old Medieval shape, makes a very decorative proportion.
>
> The Flag might be described:

"The Flag of the District of Columbia shall be the coat of arms of George Washington, namely, on a white field, two horizontal bars, Red; in the chief, three five pointed stars, Red. The size and proportion of the flag, and the two bars is optional. No crest, motto or other words or dates shall be on the Flag."

Mr. Borie added: "My plea is that it simply read just the way Washington's heraldry reads--white field with three stars in the chief (at the top), then two horizontal red stripes or bars on a white field." Mr. Lamb felt the Commission would have to make up its mind whether it wants a liberal interpretation in the flag or take the essentials of heraldry and make a good flag out of that. He said: "If we can get a better looking flag with a red bar at the top and a red bar at the bottom and the stars in the middle, the change would be warranted. I think you could take a vertical stripe and put the stars in the middle. Personally, I don't like the unbalanced effect that you would get if you cut off the white at the bottom, which is fairly essential."

Mr. Manship said: "As a general proposition I like the idea of an eagle for the District. However, to me this design of three stars and the red bars suggests to me that it is a pleasant flag. I think it is nice to get away from the formalization we see in the modern flag. There is plenty of opportunity for the use of other types of representations. It gives relief to geometric shapes. The dragon on the flag of China is nice. The lions on the flags of the British also. I think it is pleasant, the thought of putting the eagle on the District of Columbia Flag." Mr. Borie replied that unless it is a very large one, it is impossible to recognize an eagle far away. "I think the simpler the flag the better", he said. Mr. Manship felt that it is fine to have the stars on the top because they belong on the top.

After further discussion the Commission agreed to the following: The Commission favor some form of a flag that is evolved out of the heraldry of George Washington.

Thereupon, in accordance with arrangements made, the members of the District of Columbia Flag Commission joined the conference. The following were present: Hon. M. C. Hazen, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and Chairman of the District of Columbia Flag Commission; Captain A. D. Hopping, representing the Secretary of War; Lieut. J. W. Murphy, representing the Secretary of the Navy; and Mr. G. M. Thornett, Secretary to the Board of Commissioners, who is serving as Secretary of the District of Columbia Flag Commission; also Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, flag expert of the Quartermaster General's Office, War Department.

Mr. Clarke opened the discussion, saying: "Mr. Hazen, we spent some time on this at our September meeting and there are a great many things one can do as a matter of personal taste. I expect it is a controversial subject." Mr. Hazen replied, "It is very controversial."

Mr. Thornett reported that the District of Columbia Flag Commission has received a letter from the Arts Club, the Oldest Inhabitants Association, and the Daughters of the American Revolution, who cannot agree among themselves. All want to be heard on the subject. Mr. Thornett also presented a letter from Mrs. W. D. Leetch (Exhibit A-1) representing the D. A. R., with regard to a design for the flag.

Continuing, Mr. Clarke said: "If you would like the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts I can express it for them. Mr. Savage, who is not here today, put considerable time into it. We rather feel that some development of the heraldic shield of George Washington is the best approach--it is simple--it is in two colors. Whether the stars should be in the top or at the bottom can be decided later; also whether the stripes should be horizontal or vertical. We feel that some one ought to make further study of it."

Mr. Hazen replied: "I guess you knew that when L'Enfant designed the city plan, his original design showed Washington's shield on it. It is shown distinctly on what is known as the Ellicott Map of Washington, dated 1800."

Mr. Clarke said: "It has possibilities of making a very handsome flag. A flag is much more effective if it is plain. Mr. Lamb and I have had much to do with flags at the New York Fair. Recently we had an interesting experience. We found that a flag with a red stripe at the top and bottom would show up better from a distance."

Mr. Borie stated: "I personally made a plea that it be not confined to all those little devices but have the essential component parts of the heraldic shield of George Washington. The hoist could be longer than the fly. There is no law that makes the American Flag longer in the fly than in the hoist. The details of the width of the bars so long as they are horizontal should not be defined provided that the stars are in the chief as I have shown in some sketches. Here in sketches I made are eight different varieties of the same thing. The different widths of the bars do not interfere with the significance of the emblem.

Mr. DuBois stated: "In heraldic design the bars always come in doubles--in English heraldry the bar is one-fifth the width of the shield. Bars must be horizontal and if they are vertical they are known as paleways."

Mr. Lamb said: "Personally I don't agree with Mr. Borie that the form must agree with heraldic design. Those rules apply to a shield. We have an entirely different problem when we apply this to a flag. I think the flag has to be good looking. It has to be readable and has to have its own identity and character. If you can get a better design in the arrangement of the three red stars and bars in a different position it might be worth considering.

Mr. Shepley remarked that Mr. Lamb had suggested having the stars in the middle. Mr. DuBois said that if an eagle is used it would be looking the other way on the reverse side of the flag and further it would be quite expensive to make. Mr. Hazen asked if there should be anything, such as the letters, D. C., indicating that it was the District of Columbia Flag. Mr. Clarke replied: "My own judgment would be to stick just as closely to heraldry as possible and get a good flag. All these other designs are too complicated. I would have some one competent to make studies prepare a few designs and submit them to the Commission. Mr. Shepley remarked that if Congress had wanted the people to select the flag Congress would have so indicated in the legislation. Mr. Lamb suggested that the District of Columbia Flag Commission make some full sized flags and try them.

Mr. Clarke concluded the discussion by saying, "If you will make some studies of the flag and pick out the one you prefer I think you will be able to disarm all those people who are saying you are going to use the Washington Coat of Arms."

Mr. Hazen expressed his appreciation of this conference with the Commission of Fine Arts. He also was pleased to know that the Commission of Fine Arts had expressed its preference for the flag that was based on the Washington Coat of Arms. He said he did not consider the flag submitted as being perfect but all members of the District of Columbia Flag Commission favored it and it could be given further study in matters of detail.

A report was sent to the District of Columbia Flag Commission. (Exhibit A-2)

3. MARCONI MEMORIAL: Mr. Borie reported that yesterday he had spent the day in Washington inspecting possible locations for the proposed memorial to Marconi. He said that a few days ago he had had a talk with Mr. Piccirilli, who is quite willing to have the Commission select some other site than

Columbia Island.

Mr. Borie placed emphasis first of all on the question of policy to be followed in the placing of monuments in the National Capital, whether the monuments should be located along the Mall and in the heart of the city generally or whether they should be scattered throughout the various parts of the city. Mr. Lamb said: "I hope we don't get a row of monuments down Constitution Avenue that have no relation except that they might be across from some particular building. My idea of a location for a small monument is that it should be something intimate and very closely related either to a planned parti or to a planned landscape area around a building or in close relation to a building. For instance, in discussing that site at the Academy of Sciences this morning it occurred to me that the kind of site I have in mind could be best shown by placing a statue of Marconi on the axis of the foreground of that building rather than across the street." Mr. Manship remarked: "My comment is this. Do you want to have things related one to another? That suggests an avenue of statues as at Berlin, the Siegesallee. If as at Versailles along a Mall that might be agreeable or a grouping as of the Queens of France at the Luxembourg. On the other hand I think one of the most charming schemes is to remove the statue from the material setting of the building. It depends on the statue and subject matter whether to put it in a group of trees, as for example, the Adams Memorial in Rock Creek Cemetery. I can perfectly well see a series of statues along Constitution Avenue but there they should be related one to the other. Mr. Lamb said: "The Versailles arrangement of statues expresses just what I have in mind--a distinct relationship to a grand plan or a distinct relationship to a little plan. I object to setting down statues anywhere. It is going to have no relationship to the building." Mr. Lamb felt a Marconi Memorial

opposite the National Academy of Sciences might be too far removed to consider it as having a relationship to the building. "In the Luxembourg Gardens," he said, "you will find little statues here and there." Mr. Clarke remarked: "Generally speaking, I don't like unrelated statues. I wish it were possible that this might become the basis for a scheme for future development, that it could be indicated in a general way what form these monuments should take. What we lack here is a program which will indicate all possible sites for monuments, as those for war heroes, etc. There will be gardens around the Mellon Gallery and one opposite it that will offer many sites. It would be a very intelligent work for the Art Commission and it would eliminate all this uncertainty."

Mr. Lamb pointed out that this brings up another question that is much more ambitious, which is another Plan of 1901, that is extremely essential. "Washington", he said, "has changed in its whole atmosphere and size." It was stated that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had thus far failed in having such a new scheme for Greater Washington made.

It was suggested that the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, which has custody of the monuments in Washington, prepare a map showing the location of existing monuments and indicate available sites for future monuments. (Exhibit B) With regard to a location for the Marconi Memorial, the Commission decided that the site heretofore considered on Columbia Island was inappropriate, that the monument would be too small for such a large area and would be lost in it. Mr. Borie suggested two sites for the memorial--one the west end of Rawlins Square between the old and new Interior Department Buildings and a location on Constitution Avenue opposite the National Academy of Sciences. Mr. Finnan and Mr. Kirkpatrick of the National Park Service were

present and stated they felt certain the Secretary of the Interior would be opposed to the erection of the Marconi Memorial at the west end of Rawlins Square. Thereupon the site opposite the National Academy of Sciences was discussed. The further suggestion was made that the memorial would be even better located in the grounds of the National Academy of Sciences. The Commission requested the secretary to confer with a representative of the National Academy of Sciences and ascertain whether it would be agreeable to the Academy to have the proposed memorial located in the grounds or at the site on Constitution Avenue opposite the Academy.

(Mr. Caemmerer had a conference with Mr. Paul Brockett, Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, on Wednesday, October 19, at which time he was informed by Mr. Brockett that the Academy had steadfastly opposed the erection of memorials in the grounds of the Academy but that there would be no objection on the part of the Academy to the erection of a memorial at the site opposite their building on Constitution Avenue provided the design is allegorical and the Academy be allowed to see the design before it is executed. Mr. Caemmerer was informed by Mr. Brockett that in years past the Academy itself had considered the question of a memorial to a noted scientist opposite the building.)

4. STONEWALL JACKSON MONUMENT FOR MANASSAS BATTLEFIELD: The Commission considered a letter received from the Virginia Art Commission (Exhibit C) requesting the cooperation of the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter of securing an equestrian statue of Stonewall Jackson for Manassas Battlefield, Virginia, for which the State of Virginia has appropriated $25,000. The letter was referred to Mr. Manship for comment. Mr. Manship said $25,000 is a small amount of money for an equestrian statue, although if the monument is placed on a hill it would obviate the necessity of having a high pedestal and save the

expense of securing one. But in relation to the amount of money the Procurement Division is paying and in relation to the amount of money made available for the large sculpture groups for the Apex Building, it is better pay than those. Mr. Borie said that John Gregory last year did a statue of General Wayne for Philadelphia for about $30,000. Mr. Gregory received $16,000 for the plaster cast, $6,000-$8,000 was spent for the casting and $6,000-$8,000 for the pedestal. Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Manship if he was in favor of a competition. Mr. Manship replied: "If a national competition, I would say, yes. It is a tremendous amount of waste but on the other hand young sculptors go into it because it is good experience for them. This matter has gone so far, however, that it has to be carried out along the general lines of a competition. I have read the program and it seems to me it is very well written in a general way. The only thing that is left out is that the models should be of uniform size and I would like to add a paragraph to that effect. Two years should be allowed for completing the monument. It should not be made in a hurry. Mr. Manship drafted an additional paragraph for the program of competition, as follows:

> Uniform sized competition models to be presented in plaster uncolored on the scale of 1½ inches to the foot. The final bronze to be life and a half size.

A letter was sent to Mr. Stern accordingly. (Exhibit C-1)

5. ST. INIGOES MONUMENT: Under date of October 7, 1938, the following letter was received from Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department:

October 7, 1938.

Subject: USS TULIP Memorial, near St. Inigoes Bay.

Enclosures: 5

Gentlemen:

> The Third Deficiency Appropriation Act for 1938, dated 25 August 1937, carried an item as follows:

"Saint Inigoes, Maryland, Memorial: For acquisition of land and erection thereon of the memorial authorized by the Act approved June 15, 1937, $2,000."

The appropriation of $2,000 covers the acquisition of the property, clearing the site, erecting the memorial, fencing, and the preparation of approach from the adjacent highway. The property will cost $800.

The Bureau is submitting for the consideration and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts sketch drawings and data relative to the proposed memorial. There are enclosed:

(A) "Site of proposed Memorial" dated 19 Nov. 1937; blueprint prepared by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department.
(B) Blueprint, "Proposed Memorial - St. Inigoes, Maryland - Survey and location plan" dated 13 April 1938 (revised) P. W. Dwg. No. C-3274.
(C) Aerial photograph.
(D) Perspective in water colors.
(E) Perspective in black and white.

It is proposed to construct the memorial of granite, bearing a bronze plate stating that the memorial is erected in memory of those who lost their lives in the explosion of the USS TULIP on 11 November 1864. There is no information as to the names of the sailors whose bodies are interred at the site, nor is there any definite information as to the number of bodies.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Ben Moreell,
Chief of Bureau.

Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

The design suggested a crude masonry monument consisting of blocks of stone put together with mortar. Mr. Lamb felt the tablet was too high and the ornament unsatisfactory.

Mr. Manship likewise thought the design unacceptable and it was disapproved. He recommended a cenotaph or stele of stone, cut square with a crown of about 1½ foot. Any ornament such as a wreath should be cut into the stone, also the inscription, for which V-cut letters should be used. The Navy Department was advised accordingly. (Exhibit D)

6. NATIONAL MUSEUM EXTENSION: Mr. Louis Simon, Supervising Architect, submitted preliminary sketches for an enlarged National Museum. Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Assistant Superintendent of the National Museum, was present during the discussion. With the sketches Mr. Simon submitted several models showing proposed extensions that would bring the building within 100 feet, 70 feet or 55 feet from the Ninth Street curb. Mr. Simon said some years ago Mr. Pope had suggested that the museum extend the same distance from Ninth Street as the National Gallery is from Seventh Street, which is about 140 feet. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission had recommended 100 feet for the distance between the Ninth Street curb and the east end of the museum extension but Dr. Wetmore said that would mean a loss of one-fifth less office space than if the building were placed within 55 or 70 feet from Ninth Street. The Commission felt that the National Gallery and the Museum, even if extended, were so far apart that the relationship of one to the other would not be of importance. It would be more important to consider the museum extension in relation to the Department of Justice Building and the plaza in front of the Archives Building.

It was therefore thought that the extension might be shorter on the Ninth Street side and of greater length on the 12th Street side where, however, consideration had to be given to the proposed widening and depression of Twelfth Street through the Mall at some future time.

The models presented by Mr. Simon were tried out on the central area model of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in their Commission room. The Commission of Fine Arts suggested that the question of museum space be given further study by Mr. Simon in the light of these considerations and that the matter receive further discussion at a joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on Friday, November 18.

7. NEW DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIBRARY: The Commission were in conference with Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth and Dr. George F. Bowerman, Librarian of the District of Columbia, concerning sketches and a plot plan for the new District of Columbia Library to be located in Square 491 west of John Marshall Place. Congress in the District Appropriation Act for 1939 authorized the preparation of plans for the Act as follows:

> For the preparation of plans and specifications for a library building to be constructed on square 491 in the District of Columbia, $60,000.

Mr. Wyeth said that before any detailed sketches for the library can be made the question has to be settled whether the building shall be parallel to Constitution Avenue or Pennsylvania Avenue. The Commission considered the matter and felt that the building should be parallel to Constitution Avenue, as a result of which the building would also be parallel to the National Gallery of Art. Mr. Wyeth said members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission favor the placing of the building parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue so that the building would be parallel to the Apex Building. The Commission decided that the matter be held in abeyance until the joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on November 18.

In connection with the library building Mr. Wyeth called attention to a music hall suggested for the east side of the square in connection with the library building. Mr. Wyeth called attention also to the auditorium proposed for the east side of John Marshall Place.

8. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: Under date of October 5, 1938, a letter was received from Mr. Alfred Geiffert with a design for the landscape treatment of the National Gallery of Art grounds, as follows:

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

We are mailing to you herewith one ozalid print of my drawing No. N12-10 being the general plan for the landscape development of the grounds about the National Gallery of Art. This is a print of the plan approved by your Commission some time ago.

Further study has suggested two minor changes to this plan. They are noted as "A" and "B" on the enclosed print.

Will you kindly give this your consideration and write me informing me if these minor changes are acceptable. If need be, I will gladly meet with the Commission to go into these changes in detail.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) Alfred Geiffert, Jr.

The Commission inspected the design and approved it. A minor suggestion was made, which was indicated on the drawing. (Exhibit E)

9. APARTMENT BUILDING, 2121 Virginia Avenue, N. W. The secretary reported that Mr. Frederic A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was much concerned over the appearance of an apartment building to be built at 2121 Virginia Avenue, N. W., opposite the proposed new War Department Building. Mr. Delano had said that the location is outside the Shipstead-Luce Act area but felt if the Commission of Fine Arts could advise as to the plan it would be very desirable and helpful.

The design was made by Dillon and Abel, 1327 Connecticut Avenue, with whom the secretary conferred with regard to the matter. They voluntarily and willingly submitted a set of blue prints for the apartment building, stating however that excavation has begun and they have a permit to begin construction work. Also Mr. Abel was present to confer with the Commission concerning the design. Mr. Clarke said: "The Commission of Fine Arts appreciate the fact that they have no authority in the matter. We are particularly interested in that

part of Washington because there are new buildings intended for it, such as the War Department and we would like both for your interest and the interest of the Government that at least the color of the buildings harmonize. The Government building will be in limestone."

The Commission expressed to Mr. Abel their appreciation of his cooperative spirit and pointed out that the building will be in a prominent location and if changes could be made in it that would improve the appearance of it, it would be to the interest of the firm that they be made. Mr. Abel said it is too late to make changes in the construction plan unless it should be in some detail. The Commission then inquired about the color of the brick to be used and Mr. Abel said he proposes to use gray brick with yellow ranges as the firm had used in their apartment building at 2407--15th Street, N. W.

The Commission inspected the apartment at 2407--15th Street, N. W., at noon and felt that the gray brick in that apartment was satisfactory but that the yellow ranges should be left out in the new building on Virginia Avenue. It was also noted that the Virginia Avenue facade will be similar in design to the 15th Street apartment building. A report was sent to Mr. Abel recommending that he use gray brick for his apartment building. (Exhibit F) (See also F-1)

10. CUNO RUDOLPH SCHOOL: The Commission approved the design submitted by Mr. Wyeth for the Cuno Rudolph Public School to be built at Second and Ingraham Streets, N. W.

11. NEW WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Mr. Louis Simon submitted preliminary sketches for the new War Department Building to be located in the northwest rectangle. The design showed New York Avenue west of Virginia Avenue omitted and the headhouse and building so located that the central east and west axis would provide for an annex to the south Interior Building on the same axis.

The arrangement of the building was so planned as to retain or abolish Virginia Avenue as might be determined at some future time. The Commission gave preliminary approval to the scheme and a letter was sent to Mr. Simon accordingly. (Exhibit G)

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSION: Upon the recommendation of Mr. Borie the Commission approved the design submitted for a residence at 1430 Geranium Street, N. W.

The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p. m. Thereupon an inspection trip was made to the new Chain Bridge. The next meeting is to be held in Washington on Friday, November 18.

DESIGNS OF FLAG FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
from the District of Columbia Flag Commission

Submitted by the following:

1. Mrs. William H. Harper,
   The Wyoming Apt. 214,
   (Through Daughters of American Colonists Society)

2. Miss Katie V. Blount,
   The Evangeline, 1330 L St., N. W.

3. Mr. John Q. Sly,
   Secret Service Division,
   Treasury Department.

4. Mrs. Mary Setz-Parker,
   3718 Ingomar Street.

5. Mrs. Frisbey G. Eiker,
   2001 Kalorama Road, N. W.

6. Mr. Edgar Fuller,
   Box 103, West Salem, Ill.

7. Marion F. Holderman,
   35 Eighth Street, N. E.

8. John H. Wood,
   Amherst, Texas.
   (Temporary address, 212 T St., N. E.,
   Washington, D. C.)

9. Gen. Albert L. Cox, Commanding,
   D. C. National Guard.
   (forwards design of flag of the
   Headquarters of D. C. Militia)

10. Mrs. Charles L. Bancroft,
    1711 East Capitol Street.

11. J. B. P. Clayton Hill,
    Walter Reed General Hospital.

12. Miss Annabel Beecher Albert,
    5034 Conduit Road, N. W.

13. Design received by special delivery mail
    with no address on envelope. 8/25/38.

EXHIBIT A

14. George M. Beckett, 1743 P Street, N. W.

15. Gilbert F. Greene, 602 Massachusetts Ave., N. W.

16. Charles Dunn, 4710--49th St., N. W.

17. W. E. H., 503--3rd Street, N. W.

18. Andrew F. Eisemann, 1302 Park Road, N. W.

19. Ray G. Epperley, 728 Woodward Building.

20. Mrs. W. D. Leetch, 3 East Lennox Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

21. Mrs. B. E. A. McCann, Station A, Conduit Road, Georgetown, D. C.

X and Y J. A. Denekas, 715 8th Street, S. W. (Submitted directly)

DESIGNS SELECTED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FLAG COMMISSION

A Design based on shield portion of coat of arms of Washington family submitted through Mr. Hazen, August 24, including design by Mr. and Mrs. J. Moultrie Ward.

B Mrs. George T. Hawkins, 1616--16th Street, N. W.

B-1 Suggestion by Mrs. Hawkins to substitute Washington Shield for Capitol Building. (Second choice of D. C. Commission)

Designs received since September 29, 1938:

1. Charles G. Dunn, 4710--49th Street, N. W.

2. Miss Wilmuth Gary, 1735 New Hampshire Avenue.

3. J. A. Denekas, 715 8th Street, S. W.

4. Albert M. Walker, 1710 F Street, N. W.

5. Additional designs (2) from Mrs. Wm. D. Leetch, 3 East Lenox St., Chevy Chase, Md.

C O P Y

District of Columbia
Daughters of the American Revolution

October 15, 1938.

To the members of the
D. C. Flag Commission and
The Commission of Fine Arts in joint session:

Gentlemen:

Herewith is submitted for your consideration a Celanese banner after the proposed design by Miss Elizabeth Fry. She is a very fine artist, employed at various times with the leading jewelry and stationery houses and has developed effective catalogue work for flag and regalia manufacturers.

She believes the design meets the requirements of the Flag Commission as set forth by them being simple and inexpensive to reproduce, a distinctive adaptation of the Washington coat-of-arms, without lettering, utilizing none of the familiar landmarks of the District of Columbia, nor the District Seal, and yet appears to be a banner of considerable character. The one large white star represents the District of Columbia, the two smaller represent Maryland and Virginia who ceded territory to form the District of Columbia.

The exclusive Pennsylvania Society Sons of the Revolution, who always participate in historical events of that State and the City of Philadelphia, have illustrated opposite page 41 in their book, a Washington banner made about thirty years ago. Since then their collection has been greatly augmented. The Washington banner is strictly in accordance with the traditional shield of the Washington coat-of-arms, having the white ground with the two red bars and three red stars, in accordance with the pencil drawing submitted. It is used by them as an historical banner and is displayed in Christ Church, an historical temple of worship of which George Washington was a member.

This banner is used extensively by patriotic organizations as a display. If it should be adopted by the District of Columbia, its intention would be misinterpreted unless by arrangement and color scheme the whole were modified.

As Miss Fry is out of the city, being lately in Chicago, I am submitting this banner for her. Otherwise, I have no connection with it.

Very respectfully,
(Signed) M. D. Leetch
for Miss Fry.

EXHIBIT A-1

C O P Y

October 15, 1938.

My dear Mr. Hazen:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today appreciated the opportunity of a conference with the District of Columbia Flag Commission concerning a design for the proposed District of Columbia Flag.

After considering all of the designs and the ideas which they represent, the Commission of Fine Arts feel that the most appropriate idea upon which to base the District of Columbia Flag was the coat of arms of the Washington family, namely, three red stars in the chief and two red bars on a white field. After further studies have been made embodying this suggestion, this Commission will be glad to have another meeting with the District of Columbia Flag Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. M. C. Hazen, Chairman,
District of Columbia Flag Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A-2

C O P Y

October 21, 1938.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 15, the Commission discussed at length the question of location of monuments in Washington in connection with the subject of available sites for future monuments. This subject was brought up as a result of the Commission having been called upon to advise in the matter of a location for the proposed memorial to Guglielmo Marconi.

The Commission concluded that it would be most helpful if the National Park Service would have a map prepared showing the location of existing monuments in Washington and also the location of available sites for future memorials.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer,
Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
THE ART COMMISSION

October 6, 1938.

Chairman,
National Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

The Commonwealth of Virginia has appropriated a total of approximately twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) for an equestrian statue to be erected in memory of Stonewall Jackson on the Manassas Battlefield; the Virginia Conservation Commission being charged with the execution of this project.

The Virginia Conservation Commission, being unfamiliar with works of art and how to select a sculptor has requested the Virginia Art Commission to act for them in procuring a sculptor and an outstanding design inasmuch as the Virginia Art Commission must, under the law, pass on all works of art for the State.

As the proposed monument is to be placed on the Manassas battlefield, which is Federal property, it will be necessary for the memorial to have the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

For this reason I am writing to suggest that the State and Federal Art Commissions act jointly in the selection of a sculptor and in approving the completed design.

In conference with the Honorable Wilbur C. Hall, Chairman of the Virginia Conservation Commission and Mr. Thomas C. Colt, Jr., Director of The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, we have developed a program which we believe will insure a greater possibility for securing an outstanding design, due to the fact that the competition will be national in scope and will receive national publicity, than will be possible under any other method due to the relative small amount of money available for this purpose.

I am enclosing a copy of the plan approved by the Virginia Art Commission at its meeting on September 29, 1938, for your consideration and would appreciate it very much if you would advise me as promptly as you may find convenient of your approval of this plan or of your suggestions of any changes.

In order to hold the proposed competition at the date set, it will be necessary to get out the competition program, maps, photographs and other data necessary to give definite information to the competitors at as early date as possible.

EXHIBIT C

If you feel that the plan approved by the Virginia Art Commission should be changed and would like to have a conference either with the Virginia Art Commission or with the Chairman of the Virginia Conservation Commission and the Director of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, I shall be pleased to arrange such a conference to suit your convenience.

I am enclosing also a copy the portion of the appropriation bill enacted by the last General Assembly relative to the Stonewall Jackson statue.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Philip N. Stern,

PNA:G
Enc. 2

C O P Y

AMENDED ACTION OF THE
VIRGINIA ART COMMISSION
from the
Minutes of Sept. 29, 1938

1. The Virginia Conservation Commission will authorize the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts to conduct a National Sculpture Competition.

2. Rules and specifications for the Competition will be drawn up by the Museum, subject to the approval of the Virginia and the National Art Commissions, which by law must approve works of art for the State and for the Federal Government, respectively. All American sculptors will be invited to submit models, according to the rules and specifications, at the Museum on or before February 10, 1939.

3. A professional jury approved by the Virginia and the National Art Commission, will be invited to pass on the works submitted and to select the winning sculptor. The jury will be composed of six members: three noted sculptors, representing the academic, the middle-of-the-road, and the advanced schools of art, one member representing the Virginia Art Commission, one member representing the National Art Commission and an ex-officio member representing the Museum of Fine Arts. The majority decision of the jury must be final, and accepted by all parties.

4. The jury will meet at the Museum on February 17. They will examine the models submitted and select the ones worthy of exhibition. From the models worthy of exhibition, they will select the winning model.

5. The winning model and the models worthy of exhibition will be placed on exhibition in the Museum, beginning March 4, and the announcement of the winning sculptor will be made, with appropriate ceremonies, at that time. The competition and exhibition will be given intensive publicity.

6. The winning sculptor will be awarded a sum not less than $22,500., which sum must provide for the complete erection of the Monument on or before June 30, 1940.

7. $1,000 will be paid to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts by the Virginia Conservation Commission to assist in defraying the expenses of the Competition and the Exhibition; and the conduct of the Competition and Exhibition, and the details thereof, will be entrusted to the Museum, with the understanding that they will be carried out with the same professional thoroughness that has brought national recognition to the Museum for its former major exhibition.

C O P Y

1938 Acts of Assembly

STONEWALL JACKSON STATUE

The Virginia Conservation Commission is hereby authorized, empowered and directed to erect, or cause to be erected, upon that tract of land located in Prince William County and known as the "Henry Farm", upon which the First and Second Battles of Manassas, or Bull Run were fought and upon which General Thomas J. Jackson received the immortal name of "Stonewall", a suitable equestrian statue of Thomas J. Jackson ("Stonewall" Jackson) and his horse, "Old Sorrell". For the purpose of providing the funds necessary to defray the expenses incident to the erection of such monument, there is hereby appropriated to the Virginia Conservation Commission, out of any moneys in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,500.00, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose. Payments out of this appropriation shall be made by the Treasurer on warrants of the Comptroller issued upon vouchers signed by the Chairman of said Commission or by such other person or persons as shall be designated by the Commission for that purpose - - - - - - - - - - - - - -$12,500.00

($12,500.00 appropriated for both years of biennium, 1938-1940, making total of $25,000.00)

C O P Y

October 17, 193[illegible].

Dear Mr. Stern:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 15, I brought to the attention of the Commission your letter of October 6, concerning the equestrian statue of Stonewall Jackson, which the State of Virginia proposes to have erected on the Manassas Battlefield.

The Commission will be pleased to cooperate with the Virginia Conservation Commission and also with the Virginia Art Commission in this matter. The members of the Commission feel that $25,000 is a small amount for an equestrian statue but if the monument is placed on a hill that would obviate the necessity of a high pedestal, which is usually quite costly.

Your letter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission. Mr. Manship studied the program of competition and states that it is well written. However, he suggests adding a paragraph calling for "uniform sized competition models to be presented in plaster uncolored on the scale of 1½ inches to the foot. The final bronze to be life and a half size".

The Commission of Fine Arts concur in these suggestions of Mr. Manship.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Philip N. Stern,
Art Commission of the
Commonwealth of Virginia,
Richmond, Virginia.

EXHIBIT C-1

C O P Y

October 17, 1938.

Dear Admiral Moreell:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on October 15, 1938, considered the design you submitted for the St. Inigoes (Maryland) Memorial.

The design was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission, who feels that the design has too much the appearance of masonry construction (which requires constant upkeep and repair) and that the bronze tablet in particular would soon be simply a black spot on the monument. The design submitted was therefore disapproved.

Mr. Manship suggests that the monument take the form of a cenotaph or stele as suggested by the sketch inclosed, to consist of one block of stone cut square with simple molding at the top. Any ornament on the stone should be carved into the stone as also the inscription, for which the Roman V-cut letter should be used.

The Commission wish to thank you for bringing this matter to their attention.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Rear Admiral Ben Moreell,
Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks,
Navy Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

October 15, 1938.

My dear Mr. Geiffert:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on October 15, 1938, considered the landscape plan for the National Gallery of Art, which you submitted.

The Commission approve the plan. A minor suggestion was made, which was indicated on the drawing. The drawing is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Alfred Geiffert, Jr.,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

October 15, 1938.

Dear Mr. Abel:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today appreciated the opportunity to see your design for the apartment building at 2121 Virginia Avenue and to talk with you about it. As you were informed the Commission are particularly concerned in the design and appearance of your building in view of its proximity to the new War Department Building.

It may be too late to change the design of the building but if it can be done, the Commission would like to see the proches omitted from the Virginia Avenue facade.

As to the color of the brick, the Commission favor a gray colored brick similar in color to limestone. A color of brick such as was used for the Lafayette and Rochambeau Apartments, the Universalist Church and also the Social Security Building, 1724 F Street, N. W., would be acceptable.

The Commission inspected your apartment building at 2407--15th Street. The shade of the gray brick in that facade would be suitable for your new building but it would be most desirable to leave out the ranges of yellow brick. The Commission recommend that for the sake of the appearance of your building this be done.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Joseph H. Abel,
Dillon and Abel,
1327 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

The United Clay Products Company

INVESTMENT BUILDING

Washington, D. C.

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
OCT 26
NOTED

October 25, 1938.

Dillon and Abel,
1327 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. Joseph Abel
Re: Governor Shepherd Apartment

Gentlemen:

In keeping with your recent request, we have been successful in having our manufacturer change the Face Brick order given us sometime ago by Mr. McInerney for the above project, even though they were already in production. You will re-call that our original order was to furnish Brick to match those recently used by Mr. McInerney in his Fifteenth Street Apartment. However, the factory will now eliminate approximately two-thirds of the Buff Brick in that particular range and will substitute Gray shades therefor, which will comply with the request of the Fine Arts Commission.

For your information, the factory is now in full production on the revised order and you may expect delivery of Brick on the job not later than three weeks from date.

We are very happy at all times to cooperate with the suggestions of the Fine Arts Commission and feel that we are very fortunate to have the factory make this change at this late date without penalty.

Very truly yours,

THE UNITED CLAY PRODUCTS COMPANY

J. E. Peterson
Assistant Treasurer.

JEM./t

EXHIBIT F-1

C O P Y

October 17, 1938.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on October 15, 1938, gave preliminary approval to the general plan submitted by you for the new War Department Building, which is so located that the central east and west axis is to provide for an annex to the South Interior Department Building on the same axis.

This scheme is predicated on closing New York Avenue and the arrangement of the buildings is so planned as to retain or abolish Virginia Avenue (in the Northwest Rectangle) as may be determined at some later date.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G